DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 713 88 EA 008 631

TITLE Joint Public-Parochial Planning Councils. Final

Report 1975-1976. Report No. 7702.

INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research

and Evaluation.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

(DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jun 76 NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Experimental Programs; *Interschool

Communication; *Parochial Schools; Program

Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Public Schools:

Questionnaires: *School Surveys

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA

Title III; *Joint Public Parochial Planning Councils

Project; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

This report briefly describes Philadelphia's Joint Public Parochial Planning Councils (JPC) project and presents an evaluation of the project's impact during the 1975-76 school year. The JPC project is intended to provide sustained interaction between the Philadelphia School District and the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. During 1975-76, 102 joint programs involving 354 teachers and 5,284 students from 66 public and 60 parochial schools were in operation. Data for the evaluation were gathered through onsite observation of joint programs, as well as separate questionnaires completed by a sample of principals, teachers, and students. Evaluators found that most JPC participants were satisfied with their program activities and credited the project with improving communications between public and parochial schools. Although the survey showed no significant change in student attitudes, teachers and students reported that intersystem social relationships were established and progressed throughout the year. Sample copies of the observational report form and the survey questionnaires are included in the appendix. (Author/JG)



US DEPERTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EOUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR DRGANIZATION DRIGIN. ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JOINT PUBLIC-PAROCHIAL PLANNING COUNCILS

Final Report

1975-1976

Report Number 7702

Project Evaluators: Marion Kaplan Larry Aniloff

Camilla Grigsby

FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

June 1976



THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools Michael P. Marcase

Executive Deputy Superintendent Robert L. Poindexter

Associate Superintendent for School Services
David A. Horowitz

Executive Director, Office of Federal Programs
Thomas C. Rosica

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President
Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President
Mr. Augustus Baxter
Mrs. Lawrence Boonin
Dr. Philip Davidoff
Mr. George Hutt
Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.
Mrs. Michael Stack
George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Michael H. Kean, Executive Director Research and Evaluation

Stephen H. Davidoff, Assistant Director Federal Evaluation Resource Services

This project was funded under ESEA Title III administered through the Office of Federal Programs, Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE	Ρ	RO	JE	CT	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1
	R	ΑT	10	NΑ	L	Ξ	•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•					•	•		•	•		•		1
	E	ΧP	E C	ΤE	D	0	UΤ	СО	ME	S	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•				•			1
	Р	RO.	J E	СТ	. [ÞΕ	S I	G N				•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•			•			2
	P	RE	v I	o u	S	F	I N	D I	NG	S	•			•				•		•			•	•							3
THE	19	97	5 -	19	76	5	E V	AL	UA	Τi	0 N	İ	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•			•	•		•	•	3
	E i	JΑI	_U	ΑТ	10	N	D	E S	I G	N	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•				•		•	•	3
	1 1	1P I	. E	ME	ΝT	Α.	T I	ON		-		•	•					•	•	•	•		•			•		•		•	4
	Α٦	ΓΤ.	1	NM	ΕN	T	0	F	0В.	JE	СТ	ŧν	ES	;	•					•					•			•	•	•	6
	S١	J P F	L	ΕM	ΕN	T	٩L	D	AT/	Ą					•		•		•	•				•		•	•				10
	St	MML	1A	RY	Α	N E)	CO	NCI	LU	S I	0 N	S		•	•	•	•				•					•			•	11
TABL	Ε	1:		P	RO	G F	RAI	4 :	ST;	λT	IS	T I	c s						•	•								•	•	•	13
TABL	Ε	2:		J	PC	F	R	OGI	RAN	1	s U	MM	AR	Υ					•				•								14



ABSTRACT

The Joint Public Parochial Planning Councils Project (JPC), provides a vehicle for sustained interaction between the School District of Philadelphia and the Archdiocese, through district Councils and joint school programs.

Project evaluation assessed program implementation and impact on inter-system student attitudes.

A total of 102 joint programs involving 66 public and 60 parochial schools were in operation during 1975-1976. These programs included 354 teachers and 5,284 students. Results from questionnaires and the evaluators' observations found that the majority of the project participants were satisfied with their program activities and credited the JPC project with enabling better communications between public and parochial schools at all levels. For the students and parents involved in the joint programs concerned with ethnic studies, JPC provided an increased awareness and understanding of the cultural diversity found in Philadelphia.

Although a pre and post attitude survey failed to find a significant change in student attitudes toward those from the other system, teachers and students reported that intersystem social relationships were established and progressed throughout the project year.



THE PROJECT

RATIONALE

The Joint Public-Parochial Planning Councils Project (JPC) recognizes the importance of intersystem cooperation in providing quality education to all Philadelphia school students. The JPC, through its district councils and joint school programs, provides a vehicle for sustained interaction between the two systems.

JPC has been guided in its organization and program formulation by the following overall needs:

- l) To develop a climate of cooperation between the public and parochial school systems of Philadelphia.
- 2) To involve the students in both systems in constructive programs of an educational or educationally-related nature.
- 3) To provide the two systems with a mechanism to plan, organize, direct, and implement joint activities involving students, parents, teachers, and administrators.
- 4) To foster awareness and understanding among the respective school system populations.
- 5) To explore new means of furthering good community relations.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Projected program accomplishments for the fourth year of the project are:

- 1. To increase the number of interactions between students of public and parochial schools in this program and in spin-off programs.
- 2. To encourage the eight District Planning Councils to initiate new joint programs.
- 3. To systemize communication between public and parochial schools on the operational level.



- 4. To expand opportunities for parents of both systems to develop better relations.
- 5. To improve the quality and increase the quantity of dissemination on this project specifically, and of inter-system cooperation generally.

PROJECT DESIGN

Sixty-six public and 65 parochial schools will participate in joint programs involving approximately 8,700 students in grades K-12 and 350 teachers. Program subject areas will include science, ethnic studies, communications, creative arts, vocational skills and physical education. Many of the activities will use the Bicentennial as a focus for their programs.

Approximately 100 parents will participate in a total of 5 workshops to be held in mathematics, mental health, behavior modification and training as voluntary aides. Three districts plan to have district-wide workshops for public and public and principals and other school personnel to cooperatively explore ways of meeting educational needs. Two districts will provide principal/teacher orientation workshops for those who are participating in other JPC activities.

The eight sub-districts will continue to operate district councils to coordinate and plan joint activities. Following a recommendation from the 1974-1975 on-site evaluation team, they will be encouraged to ment at least every six weeks.

PREVIOUS FINDINGS

The project evaluation for 1973-1974 focused on program implementation. Results from on-site monitoring and program-participant questionnaires indicated that the success of joint student programs depended on the extent to which they met regularly and frequently enough, were enjoyable, and provided students with opportunities for interaction.

The 1974-1975 evaluation continued to assess program implementation and looked at the project's impact on inter-system student attitudes. Results from questionnaires and the evaluators' observations indicated that the majority of the project participants were satisfied with their program activities and credited the JPC project with enabling better communications between public and parochial schools. Although a pre-post attitude survey failed to find a significant change in student attitudes toward those from the other system, teachers and students reported that intersystem social relationships were established and progressed throughout the project year.

THE 1975-1976 EVALUATION

EVALUATION DESIGN

The current year's evaluation of the JPC project continued to assess program implementation. In addition, the evaluation sought to determine if participation in project activities affected the friendship choices of the student participants.

An observational form (Appendix A) was developed for use

by the evaluators during on-site monitoring of joint student programs. Principal and teacher questionnaires (Appendix B) were distributed to a random sample of participants to ascertain the perceived effectiveness of the JPC activities.

A student sociometric questionnaire (Appendix C) was administered to 264 students in 11 joint activities at the beginning and again at the end of the program. Each student received a pre-and posttest score calculated on the percentage of cross-system choices indicated. A correlated test was used to determine if there was a significant gain between pretest and posttest in the number of cross-system choices. Four programs were periodically observed to record instances of cross-system interaction between students.

IMPLEMENTATION

Project implementation closely followed the proposed project design. Supportive program statistics are provided in Attainment of Objectives 1, 2, and 4.

City-wide Coorddinators

The public and parochial city-wide coordinators have provided administrative support to the project, as a whole, and directional assistance to the district coordinators and councils. This enabled the project to expand and decentralize, while maintaining its prior level of effectiveness. Also, one city-wide JPC newsletter was published.

Joint Public-Parochial Activities

In addition to implementing 102 joint activities within the JPC project, there is evidence that JPC has served as a catalyst for inter-system cooperation outside of the project.

Seventeen out of the 26 principals responding to question-naires indicated that their school had participated in inter-school sharing of equipment, facilities and materials outside of the program. Thirteen of the 26 principals reported that the JPC program had served as an impetus for non-JPC joint public-parochial activities.

Principal questionnaire comments and interviews with district coordinators provided examples of other joint activities. School personnel and parents have participated in joint faculty meetings and in joint Home and School workshops and meetings.

Inter-system Student Attitude

Although no statistical evidence was found to support significant attitude change during the year, an indicator of progress in inter-system social relationships which suggests favorable changes in attitude was that 30 of the 36 teachers questioned expressed satisfaction in the amount of social progress students made during the year.



ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: To provide opportunities for interaction between public and parochial school students in joint educational or educationally related programs.

The objective was attained.

One hundred two joint programs were in operation during the 1975-1976 school year. The programs involved 66 public and 60 parochial schools and provided activities for over 5,000 students (Table 1). Although the number of student participants has remained approximately the same, the number of different programs has increased by 46%. This reflects both an increase in the variety of activities offered by the project and a reduction in the number of large programs.

The evaluators monitored 26 joint programs to assess program organization and student interaction. In looking at facilitators of interaction, it was found that 18 of 26 programs used seating/grouping arrangements which were conductive to crosssystem communication. Sixteen of the programs included opportunities for student interaction through such measures as a student involvement in small group activities and allowance for student mobility within the group. Structured affective techniques and/or informal affective measures were observed in 9 of the 26 programs.

In ail of the observed programs, the students appeared to be interested in the activities. It was concluded that the students exhibited a comfortable working/socializing relationship in 21 cases.

Responses from 33 of 36 teachers on the principal-teacher questionnaire indicated that they were satisfied with the progress made by the students in the subject area covered by the JPC activity. Thirty of them were also satisfied with the progress made in social relationships between the students from different schools. Responses from 22 of 26 principals on the principal-teacher questionnaire indicated that they were satisfied with the progress made by the students in the subject area covered by the JPC activity.

Objective 2: To have the eight planning councils at the local level plan, organize, and implement joint activities, including students, parents, teachers, and administrators.

The objective was attained.

All of the eight districts operated JPC Councils. Each was headed by one public and one parochial school coordinator acting as liaisons between the local programs and the city-wide coordinators.

Seven of the districts had councils which met an average of 4 times between October, 1975 and April, 1976. The districts included principals, other school administrators, teachers and parents on their councils. Four of these districts also included students and community representatives.

The evaluators attended 6 meetings. It was observed that agendas were directed toward the issues of council organization, JPC orientation, updating program status, and planning. Several of the councils were concerned with organizing district-wide JPC programs, such as parent, teacher and principal workshops, and art and musical presentations. Although one of the councils did not meet on a regular basis, it did provide proposals to be considered

for the 1976-1977 school year.

Objective 3: To develop better communications between public and parochial systems on all levels.

The objective was partially attained.

Twenty-two of the 26 principals and 32 of the 36 teachers who had responded to the JPC principal-teacher questionnaire indicated that there had been an increase in communication between systems as a result of participation in JPC activities. Participants cited telephone conversations and meetings as the primary vehicles used in planning for JPC. Several principals and teachers reported that there is now increased communication between the schools regarding non-JPC concerns.

The evaluators made periodic visits throughout the year to 2 ethnic studies and 2 arts and crafts programs in order to ascertain if there was an increase in the incidence of cross-system communication among students. The percentage of cross-system instances of interaction was calculated from the total interactions observed during unstructured time at each session. It was found that all 4 programs exhibited a continuous upward trend in the percentage of cross-system interaction. Program interaction scores ranged from 0 to 25% at the first observed session and from 38% to 58% at the last sessions observed. However, the student sociometric questionnaire did not indicate that there was a significant increase in the percentage of cross-system friendship choices.

Objective 4: To provide opportunities for interaction between parents of public and parochial students in project activities.

The objective was attained.

Seventy parent aides were involved in 22 of the joint student programs. Approximately 80 parents participated in 5 workshops sponsored by JPC. In addition to this, many of the joint programs had culminating activities to which the parents of the students were invited.

Objective 5: To provide opportunities for students, parents, and teachers to increase their awareness and understanding of the cultural diversity represented in Philadelphia's communities and the contributions of the various cultural and ethnic groups to the Nation's heritage.

The objective was attained.

Twenty-one JPC programs involving 44 schools, 47 teachers and approximately 1,000 students were concerned with either ethnic studies, the Philadelphia area heritage, or activities which incorporated Bicentennial themes. Trips of historical, cultural, and social interest were taken by several of the groups. Many programs with art, drama and musical activities used content and themes from colonial times in carrying out their creative arts.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

One aim of the JPC Project is to increase the level of public-parochial cooperation apart from JPC sponsored activities. Approximately one-half of the principals and teachers who have responded to the evaluation questionnaire indicated that J°C has served as an impetus for other types of cross system cooperation. In many schools, educational facilities and resources such as school auditoriums and visual and auditory equipment are now being shared. Principals and teachers reported examples of spin-off activities between schools including joint assemblies, trips, school newspapers, science fairs, and faculty meetings.

Twenty-six percent of the joint student activities were held during the school day. The remaining programs took place after school and on Saturdays. JPC is concerned with identifying those conditions which influence successful program implementation. Therefore, the informal process evaluation included comparisons of projected and observed attendance at all of the monitored student activities which took place after school. It was found that the student programs had an average attendance rate of 73%. Project staff considered this to be satisfactory. Responses on the teachers' questionnaires concerning program effectiveness and results on the student sociometric questionnaires will be analyzed in terms of during school time programs and after school programs in order to ascertain if the time of day is a significant factor in program effectiveness.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Joint Public-Parochial Planning Councils Project operates as a vehicle for inter-system activities involving school administrators, teachers, students and parents. Through the public-parochial interaction and communication which results from participation in the joint programs, increased inter-system cooperation is encouraged.

During 1974-1975, JPC successfully brought public and parochial schools together in educationally-related programs and developed better communications between the schools at all levels. Lines of communication were also opened between parents of parochial and public school children. With assistance from the city-wide project staff, seven of the eight district planning councils were organized and were assuming the responsibility of planning, organizing, directing, and implementing the joint activities. For the students and parents involved in the joint programs concerned with ethnic studies and the Philadelphia area heritage, JPC provided an increased awareness and understanding of the cultural diversity found in Philadelphia. Data from evaluator observations indicated that intersystem interaction among pupils was established and progressed throughout the project year.

A major success of the JPC project for 1975-1976 lies in the increased impact that it has had on joint public-parochial system interaction. There was an increase of over 46% in the number of joint programs, 5,300 participating students, and a 32% increase

in the number of participating teachers, compared with 1974-1975 figures. In addition to the expansion in JPC participation, the project is credited with motivating numerous spinoff activities such as joint faculty meetings, parent workshops and interschool sharing of facilities, materials and equipment.

Evaluation findings suggest several implications for future project implementation. With the successful establishment of JPC district councils accomplished, greater emphasis needs to be placed on council members assuming more responsibility in the coordination and implementation of joint activities. In view of the continued increase in the number and size of JPC programs, the diffusion of project-associated-responsibilities should be encouraged.

TABLE 1

JPC PROGRAM STATISTICS

	1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975	1975 - 1976
Number of Programs	30	70	102
Public Schools	35	63	66
Parochial Schools	31	57	60
Teachers	153	268	354
Students	2,925	5,490	5,284



TABLE 2

JPC PROGRAM SUMMARY

1975-1976

District	Number of JPC Programs	Public Schools	Parochial Schools	Teachers	Students	Parents
-	7	9	9	23	500	14
2	13	8	8	73	310	50
3	6	6	80	39	847	12
4 .	3	4	4	31	298	2
ī.	ħ	8	8	23	584	9
9	3	2	2	8	160	2
7	30	18	13	93	907	34
ထ	33	Ξ	=	70	1,628	30
Total	102	99	09	268	5,284	150

*Includes 80 parents participating in JPC workshops

APPENDIX A

Program Observational Rating Scale

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

JPC PROJECT

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONAL RATING SCALE

<i>3</i> C1	Program	
Dat	•Observer	
Beg	inning Time Ending Time	
Ι.	Program Information	
	A. Number of public school students	-
	B. Number of parochial school students	
	C. Are there parent volunteers present?	
	YesNo	
	If yes, how many?	
· •	Program Description	
	class organization and teacher/student behaviors related to the activity	—
	order organization and teacher/scudent behaviors related to the activity	
•	Pacilitators of Interaction	·
•	Pacilitators of Interaction	·
•	Pacilitators of Interaction	·
:•	Pacilitators of Interaction Place a check next to either yes or no to indicate the condition of impression section may be used to substantiate what you have record. A. Does the seating/grouping arrangement of the students facilitate interaction?	·
:•	Pacilitators of Interaction Place a check next to either yes or no to indicate the condition of impression section may be used to substantiate what you have record. A. Does the seating/grouping arrangement of the students facilitate interaction?	·



C. Does the teacher appear to encourage student interaction through affective affective techniques such as social games and roll playing, and/or 2) informal affective measures? YesNoImpressions: Student Participation Place a check next to either yes or no to indicate the conditions of the impression section to substantiate what you have recorded. A. Do the students appear to enjoy being in the program? YesNoImpressions: B. Do the students appear interested in the program's activities? YesNoImpressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? YesNoImpressions:	В.	action and inc	through such	measures as stu	prortinities for studen dent involvement in sma llowance for student mo	ll-gr
1) structured affective techniques such as social games and roll playing, and/or 2) informal affective measures? Yes			Yes	No	Impressions:	
Student Participation Place a check next to either yes or no to indicate the conditionserved. Use the impression section to substantiate what you have recorded. A. Do the students appear to enjoy being in the program? Yes No Impressions: B. Do the students appear interested in the program's activities? Yes No Impressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes No Impressions:	c.	l) stru	ctured affect	ive techniques	such as social games and	_
Place a check next to either yes or no to indicate the condition observed. Use the impression section to substantiate what you have recorded. A. Do the students appear to enjoy being in the program? Yes No Impressions: Yes No Impressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes No Impressions: Yes No Impressions: Yes No Impressions:			Yes	No	Impressions:	
observed. Use the impression section to substantiate what you have recorded. A. Do the students appear to enjoy being in the program? Yes No Impressions: B. Do the students appear interested in the program's activities? Yes No Impressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes No Impressions: Yes No Impressions:	Stu	dent Par	rticipation			
Yes No Impressions: B. Do the students appear interested in the program's activities? Yes No Impressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes No Impressions:	rec	erved.	Use the impre	ession section t	o substantiate what you	
B. Do the students appear interested in the program's activities? YesNoImpressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? YesNoImpressions:	A.	Do the	1			
YesNoImpressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes NoImpressions:			Yes	NO	impressions: _	
YesNoImpressions: C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes NoImpressions:						
C. Do the public school students and the parochial school student appear to be comfortable working and/or socializing together? Yes No Impressions:	в.	Do toe	students appo	ear interested i	n the program's activit	ies?
Yes No Impressions:			Yes	No	Impressions: _	
Yes No Impressions:		·	<u> </u>	·		
Tapressions:	c.	Do the	public school to be comfor	l students and t	he parochial school stu d/or socializing togeth	dents
			Yes	No	Impressions:	
			-			
		 				

APPENDIX B Principal and Teacher Questionnaire

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION TITLE III EVALUATION

JOINT PLANNING COUNCIL PROJECT 1975-1976

ME		POSITION	:				
		PRINCIPAL	_				
HOOL		TEACHER					
One objective of between the publi result of JPC act an increase in the (principal or tea	ivities taking p communication	systems. Do lace in your between you	you feel th	at, as a			
YES	NO						
<pre>If YES, ple (i.e., meetings,</pre>	ase give specific telephone conver	c examples o sat io ns, w ri	f communicat tten communi	ion effort cation.)			
				<u> </u>			
Has the JPC prograimpetus for other	am with which you	ir school is	involved se	rved as an			
imperus for other	(non-JPC related	ır school is I) joint pub	involved se lic/parochia	rved as an l activition			
YES	NO Pelated	i) joint pub	lic/parochia	rved as an lactivition			
YES	(non-JPC related	i) joint pub	lic/parochia	rved as an lactivition			
YES	NO Pelated	i) joint pub	lic/parochia	rved as an lactivitio			
YES	NO Pelated	i) joint pub	lic/parochia	rved as an lactivitio			
YES	NO Pelated	i) joint pub	lic/parochia	rved as an lactivitio			
YES	NO ase give examples ared educational school from the	of such act	lic/parochia	l activition			
YES If YES, plea Has your school sh materials) with a	NO ase give examples ared educational school from the out of the program	of such act	lic/parochia	l activition			
Has your school sh materials) with a was utilized as pa	NO ase give examples ared educational school from the out of the program	resources (other system	lic/parochia	l activitie			
Has your school sh materials) with a was utilized as pa	NO ase give examples ared educational school from the out of the program	resources (other system	lic/parochia	l activition			
Has your school sh materials) with a was utilized as pa	NO ase give examples ared educational school from the out of the program	resources (other system	lic/parochia	l activitie			

4.	We welcome any additional comments or suggestions concerning your experience with the JPC activity	; you care to in your scho	make
		-	- <u></u> -
	THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE FOR TEACHERS (ONLY	
5.	Are you familiar with the objectives of the city-wide JPC Program?	YES	NO
6.	Did you actively participate in planning the objectives and curriculum for your JPC activity?	YES	NO
7.	Are you satisfied with the progress made in social relationships between the students from different schools?	YES	NO
8.	Are you satisfied with the progress that the students made in the subject area covered by your JPC activity?	YES	NO
9.	Are you satisfied with the student attendance from both systems? (To be answered by teachers of after-school activities)	YES	NO

APPENDIX C

JPC Student Questionnaire



THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PEDERAL EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES

JPC STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL

DATE		
	Please finish	the sentence below. You may put from one to seven
names in	the spaces. Pl	ease write both first and last names.
	THE STUDENTS T	HAT I MOST PREFER TO BE WITH DURING THIS ACTIVITY AR
	1.	
	2.	
	, 3.	
•	5.	
	6.	·
	· 7.	

NAME